Case 1:16-cr-00376-RMB Document 67 Filed 11/08/17 Page 1 of 24

Hb2WbahC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 16 Cr. 376 (RMB) V. 5 ABDULRAHMAN EL BAHNASAWY, 6 Conference 7 Defendant. 8 9 New York, N.Y. November 2, 2017 9:30 a.m. 10 11 Before: 12 HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN, 13 District Judge 14 15 APPEARANCES 16 JOON H. KIM Acting United States Attorney for 17 the Southern District of New York NEGAR TEKEEI GEORGE D. TURNER 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 DAVID E. PATTON 20 Federal Defenders of New York, Inc. Attorney for Defendant 21 SABRINA P. SHROFF -and-22 ANDREW J. FRISCH JASON D. WRIGHT 23 24 25

1 (Case called) THE COURT: Please be seated. You are ready to go? 2 3 MS. SHROFF: We are, your Honor. I've turned over the file and Federal Defenders seek 4 to be relieved at this time. There is a notice of 5 6 appearance --7 THE COURT: Well, well, we have a few preliminary issues before that can happen in my opinion. 8 9 But first I welcome, it's Mr. Frisch and Mr. Wright? 10 MR. FRISCH: That's correct, your Honor. 11 Good morning. 12 THE COURT: Good morning. Nice to see you. 13 And I think yesterday or very recently you had filed a 14 notice of appearance in this case, is that right? 15 MR. FRISCH: That's correct. We filed a notice of appearance yesterday, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: So there are a few issues and I'm almost 18 certain they are not going to be resolved all today but there 19 are a few issues. You're certainly welcome to this proceeding. 20 The status, just so you know, is I'm not relieving the Federal 21 Defenders at this time. So we are going to have at least for 2.2 the moment co-counsel. 23 Here are some of the issues that I think need to be

resolved. First of all, we, earlier in these proceedings were

aware, that you two, let's say defense counsel, incoming

24

25

defense counsel, had the opportunity, were given opportunity to meet with Mr. El Bahnasawy while incarcerated and determine whether or not you are going to represent him because this issue has come up several times during the course of these proceedings. And then ultimately you wrote Mr. Patton the following letter on May 2, 2017. It says:

Dear Mr. Patton, thank you for facilitating meetings, plural, between your client -- which would be Mr. El Bahnasawy -- and me pursuant to his recent request. Based on my discussions with him and in light of the information provided to me, I wish to inform you that if so requested by your client, I would respectfully decline to represent him.

We wish you and your client the very best.

Signed, Jason Wright. And the heading of the letter is on the Law Offices of Andrew J. Frisch.

So I need to understand what is happening here since as I say we went back and forth. So that's one issue which goes really to Mr. El Bahnasawy's intention and interests in being represented by you.

I did also get as you know a letter for him that's dated September, I think it's 24. I'm not sure if I got the date right or maybe 27. But in any event, it says:

Dear Judge Berman, I'm writing this concerning the issue about my representation. My mom and dad came to visit me last Friday and were very distressed and sad about me not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

granting permission for added counsel Dennis Edney -- which by the way, we need to cover for Edney briefly -- Mr. Jason Wright and Andrew Frisch. My mom was crying and begging me and I feel too bad to be doing this to them.

I also now think that granting these lawyers, Dennis and his team, permission to enter the case by visiting me, talking in court and getting case files would be of no harm but actually to my benefit.

I also really don't want to see my parents in this horrible state. So I please ask you, namely me, to let Dennis Edney and his team enter the case alongside the Federal Defenders as was requested by them in their letter to the Court.

This would be greatly appreciated.

So I have had this case for a long time and we have had an extraordinary number of appearances and conferences and I think I have a fair -- more than a fair -- I have an intimate understanding of Mr. El Bahnasawy and the issues in this case and I just want to make sure that whatever I do protects the integrity of these proceedings going forward.

I should point out incidentally, as you probably know, I also took Mr. El Bahnasawy's plea on or about October 13, 2016, and as you also know, we're heading to sentencing on December --

Ms. Shroff, correct me.

1 MS. SHROFF: 12th, your Honor.

THE COURT: December 12, 2017.

Anyway, that's some of the background. So I need to be certain about Mr. El Bahnasawy's intentions and your own in light of the letter you've sent.

There is subtle issue. I don't know if subtle is the right word but a delicate one. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. El Bahnasawy can be represented by whomever he wishes. It's come up in the course of these conversations about adding new counsel or not adding new counsel, two themes. One is that he always said he was happy with Federal Defenders. And I have said it on the record many times that just in my observation, Federal Defenders as done everything conceivable that I've experienced that a defense lawyer could do for their client including through the plea. And the plea as I said on October 13, 2016 which I took myself and I thought then and think now is rock solid.

So I want to understand your role, the parents' role, woman you represent, if you represent the parents too, whether there's any conflict of interest between if you do -- which I think you do -- representing the parents and representing the son, if their interests are aligned or if there's any difference. So that's one issue that I need to have resolved rather soon.

MR. FRISCH: May I, judge?

THE COURT: Yes. And could you just preliminarily tell me what, if anything, Mr. Edney, what role, if any, he plays because his name has come up along with the two of you and from time to time. So I don't know where he fits into the picture.

MR. FRISCH: So Mr. Edney is a lawyer in Canada who has expertise both with Canadian nationals and in these types

has expertise both with Canadian nationals and in these types of cases and he was essentially consulted by Mr. El Bahnasawy's parents with regard to issues regarding the defendant's citizenship in Canada. That's essentially his role.

THE COURT: So he is not entering the case?

MR. FRISCH: Correct.

THE COURT: And he represents the parents or has?

MR. FRISCH: My understanding is that he was brought in to consult with the parents for the defendant. And to the extent that our appearance is permitted in the case, it may be that Mr. Edney becomes a member of our team. But that's the background of how he came to be involved.

THE COURT: OK. But he, correct me if I'm wrong, was probably contacted as you were by the parents in the first instance?

MR. FRISCH: I believe that's correct.

THE COURT: Not by Mr. El Bahnasawy?

MR. FRISCH: That's my understanding.

Your Honor, we're aware that there have been

discussions over many months about the defendant's representations and who would represent him. We made ourselves available. And we are aware that there have been discussions and his own thinking as to who he wanted to represent at a particular point in time.

We have made ourselves available as your Honor knows for the correspondence with the Court and, essentially, have allowed ourselves to be guided by what his particular interests are even putting aside what his parents' interests may be.

Most recently he has told us unequivocally that he wishes Mr. Wright and me to represent him and that's what brings us here today.

THE COURT: Right. So that's the change that is causing you to sort of reverse course that you set forth in the letter of May 2, 2017 to me?

MR. FRISCH: That is correct.

THE COURT: Or to Mr. Patton.

MR. FRISCH: That is correct. It's a question of the defendant's change of heart and his intent and his desires. We have been guided by those things.

THE COURT: OK. And what is your role, if any, vis-a-vis the parents or the family? Do you represent them as well?

MR. FRISCH: We have represented them. We continue to represent them as parents looking out for their son. That's

the extent of our representation of them.

THE COURT: Right. And so I'm not going to resolve this today but so, you don't perceive that there is any conflict in or potential conflict in your role as counsel for the parents and also counsel for the son? I say that, particularly, in light of — incidentally, this case had been under seal and the precipitating factor of one of them in my mind for unsealing the case was this change or these letters about counsel. And of course counsel asking to be able to see the case file which we have started to make available to everybody because we've unsealed the case and the case is now public.

So in that file which you no doubt have seen, you've seen what I have seen which is Mr. El Bahnasawy even up until the time and including in his letter having an attachment for Federal Defenders and Ms. Shroff. And in particular he is asking in his letter to let you all come into the case but also he says "alongside the Federal Defenders". So I don't know if that's possible or feasible or how that works. So those are two of the issues that I think need to be resolved ASAP and I don't know that they are going to get resolved today.

MR. FRISCH: Understood, judge. I perceive no actual or potential conflict with regard to the parents. I might add that their flight is late landing at LaGuardia this morning.

Otherwise, they'd be here personally and they may still get

here in time.

And there plainly has been an evolution of thinking in Mr. El Bahnasawy's thoughts about his representation. We appreciate that all. We can report to the Court is that his interest in having us represent is unequivocal as far as we know and hence, the filing of a notice of appearance.

THE COURT: Are you planning to be co-counsel with Federal Defenders as he requested in his letter to me dated September 27, 2017?

MR. FRISCH: I understand that is something that he requested in the past but I do not believe that's his desire now and so it is not --

THE COURT: That's what it says in that letter.

MR. FRISCH: I understand.

THE COURT: Do you think that's changed?

MR. FRISCH: I believe that's changed, judge?

MS. SHROFF: May I be heard briefly?

THE COURT: Yes. Sure.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I cannot agree with some of the factual statements made by Mr. Frisch here today. But I think at end of the day the Federal Defenders of New York will not be able to be co-counsel with private counsel. I do not believe that's appropriate given the Federal Defenders' commitment no serving and working for people who cannot afford private counsel.

Our office has turned over the file. We have given them, new counsel, all of the paperwork already. Should there be something we're missing, I'm sure they can reach out to us or the government, complete their file and move on and hopefully represent Mr. El Bahnasawy to his content.

THE COURT: Yes. So you've heard there's one issue that I must get over which is there's been equivocation in this case and that needs to be resolved and the issue of potential conflict. I'm not saying there is one but, historically, as you all have recognized, there has been a difference of opinion between the parents and Mr. El Bahnasawy. Maybe that's now totally resolved. I don't know, we certainly have to pursue that.

So that's where things stand.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, Mr. El Bahnasawy is allowed to choose his counsel because he wants to please himself and his parents. He is really allowed to consider doing something because he values how his parents would react.

And frankly, Mr. El Bahnasawy deserves that kind of finality. He's a young man. He is certainly very dear to our to office and we want nothing but the best for him and letting him proceed with private counsel at this point would actually stop the kind of back and forth that is truly troublesome for such a young man

THE COURT: Yes, just because it's easiest.

MS. SHROFF: No.

THE COURT: And I'm not suggesting we're not going to get there but we are definitely methodically want to know whether there's a change and the change is definitive and whether or not there is a conflict situation.

For example, Ms. Shroff, suppose there were a conflict, then what, for the point of view of Federal Defenders?

MS. SHROFF: You mean if there were a conflict?

THE COURT: Yes. If I did what you say, dropped you out of the case, you're going gone and it turned out that there is some — and I'm not suggesting there is by the way. There may, in my mind I could see that it needs to be discussed, then you come back or you don't come back?

MS. SHROFF: It happens all the time.

THE COURT: What, you come back?

MS. SHROFF: Sure. If the Court finds that there's a conflict, should Mr. El Bahnasawy decide it's in his best interests to have his old lawyers back, assist more with private counsel, all of those are options available to him.

But personally, your Honor, having been in this predicament, I fully understand for the client's sake -- and there is no one who matters more than the client -- it is best for him to allow him to proceed with the lawyers who are sitting with him at this table.

THE COURT: I'm not suggesting that won't be the outcome but there are some steps that have to be taken before then.

MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, if I may, as the Court is aware, the government takes no position, whatsoever, on the matter of the defendant's choice of counsel beyond making sure that the defendant's been made aware of his rights. We note that as the Court is aware, he has had court appointed counsel since his first appearance. We are not aware of any change in his financial condition that would enable him to pay for retained counsel. And so as it is the case that a third party is paying for the defense counsel, we suggest as in the ordinary course that the Court, that a Curcio hearing be held so that the Court can assess whether there is a potential conflict with respect to the third party payor issue.

THE COURT: I think you're absolutely right and that is going to be the outcome of today's proceeding. We are going to set a date for such a hearing and I'm going to ask everybody who wants to but ask them to do is to submit to the Court questions that they would like. Because it's in everybody's interests, Mr. El Bahnasawy's, proposed new defense counsel, Federal Defenders, the government and the Court and the integrity of these proceedings, that we continue. I think we've done things pretty methodically up until now but we just as we're heading toward the December 12 sentencing that we get

it right as it were and that is my determination.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, there is no way Mr. El Bahnasawy may proceed to sentence by December 12 given this flux.

THE COURT: You're saying so many contradictory things, Ms. Shroff. You are saying you want out and you are saying you want them in and they should be in and now you're arguing that Mr. El Bahnasawy can't do a December 12. That's what the record says at the moment. It says we are going to sentence on December 12. So before that gets disrupted we have to make sure that everybody knows what they're doing and not doing something just because it's expedient just because I want to please my mother or you want to please Mr. El Bahnasawy or whatever, whatever.

So there does have to be a Curcio hearing. It does have to involve the questions of third party payor but it has to fundamentally have the questions that need to be asked and answered with respect to previous changes of heart. And not only changes of heart but as recently as Mr. El Bahnasawy's September 27 letter is a statement that he wants new counsel alongside the Federal Defenders. So all of that has to be fleshed out. I could do it quickly. I probably could do it really next week. But I do need to see questions. And defense counsel I would like to have them submit questions that they want me to pose and you as well, Ms. Shroff.

So I'm not granting outgoing status to Federal

Defenders. We do have and we welcome counsel here but we have
to do this in the correct way.

(Continued on next page)

MR. FRISCH: Can I be heard on one issue, Judge?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. FRISCH: I think under the circumstances --

THE COURT: You understand, by the way, I'm not making any comment in any way disparaging your role.

MR. FRISCH: We completely understand, Judge.

THE COURT: Appreciate that.

MR. FRISCH: There's no question that an appropriate inquiry of Mr. Bahnasawy needs to be made in light of the inconsistent statements, and we're saying it's completely understandable; we're completely on board by that. To the extent that we can help by proposing questions in advance, we'll certainly participate in that exercise.

With regard to a <u>Curcio</u>, government counsel told me before we started today about their view that when a third party pays for fees, there necessarily needs to be a <u>Curcio</u> hearing. I've been doing this for 30 years, and I don't purport to know every aspect of the law, I don't think that's right. Counsel gave me a case, and they'll give me others if there are; I'm happy to look at them. I think parents of a defendant have the right to pay for the representation of their child without the need of triggering a <u>Curcio</u> hearing, so I'd ask the Court to give us an opportunity to look at the authority presented to us by the government so we can take a position on that.

THE COURT: Whether we call it a <u>Curcio</u>, or whatever we call it, we are going to do inquiry with questions, and if third-party payor is an aspect of it, in my mind, because of the potential, based on the historical record, difference of opinion, let's say, and I don't know if it's a conflict of interest between Mr. Bahnasawy and his parents, but I know he had been very diligent in trying to walk the line of respecting his parents and doing what they wish, but I know historically he's also been very close to Ms. Shroff and the Federal Defenders and has always indicated to me that he likes having them as counsel. That's the thrust of the inquiry.

If the government has some questions that have to do with third-party payor, and I've asked questions along those lines in the past too, so be it. It doesn't hurt. It's really whose interests and what interests they have had or will have that I'm driving at.

And by the way, I don't recall, and it doesn't matter because it's history now, at the very, very beginning, when I got the case, the Federal Defenders was already attached. I don't know what, if anything, happened in magistrate's court, but I think that's historical, and I'm not concerned about that.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, we were just assigned as regular --

THE COURT: Yes, that's what I assume.

Let's assume, hypothetically for the moment, that we get over this by this inquiry that we do and we move forward, do you have any plan, based on what you've seen so far in the record, of what you want to do? We do have the sentencing on for December 12. It was extended. It was an earlier date at one point, but I think it was extended at the request of Federal Defenders.

MR. FRISCH: Your Honor, we understand the Court's interest and the government's interest in expedition. There is a date set for sentencing of December 12, and we realize that. At the same time, we just received from the Federal Defenders a flash drive, which I understand contains the file, their file, whatever discovery was provided, and certainly we need to review that before we can take a position as to scheduling.

What we would propose is to give us an opportunity to look at the file and the discovery, appear before the Court again, after the inquiry that your Honor described, appear before the Court as scheduled on December 12 and report to the Court where we think we are with regard to scheduling, understanding the Court's interest in moving quickly.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, the file was also turned over yesterday. Mr. Bahnasawy has a complete copy of the file in its entirety.

THE COURT: Yes, I understand. I think I may have in

one of my endorsements suggested that you start looking at the file as I was unsealing it and as the records were becoming available to you. But there probably are, no doubt, more and obviously you should have every opportunity to know everything that's happened in the case if you're going to be counsel in the case, as you are. That's my preliminary thinking.

I would like the government to submit questions that they want posed vis-à-vis the counsel situation. It would be helpful if those questions went beyond just the financial "who's paying" thing, but also the issues that I've surfaced which are potential conflicts of interest or expressed differences of opinion in the past and also incoming counsel's earlier, May 2 letter saying that they would respectfully decline to represent him, even if he asked. That's a big change, so I would like to make sure we just get everything narrowed down.

MS. TEKEEI: We can certainly do that, your Honor. When would you like to have those questions?

THE COURT: What's realistic for you to be able to do your share of that?

MS. TEKEEI: We can have something by the end of the week.

THE COURT: Great. Do you all anticipate filing questions you would like me to ask? I think it would be in everybody's interests to be as thorough in this proceeding as

1 possible.

MR. FRISCH: I think, your Honor, it might be a good idea if the government and we work together.

THE COURT: Fine.

MR. FRISCH: We may not come to agreement on every question, but perhaps that should be our first step, to see if we can agree, and then if we can't, we can submit those letters.

THE COURT: Supplement, OK. How much time do you need? They'll have questions available by the end of the week.

MR. FRISCH: It seems to me we can confer with them in the next few days and hopefully get something to your Honor by the end of the week.

THE COURT: I think that would be tomorrow.

MR. FRISCH: That would be tomorrow. I think we can do it.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. TEKEEI: We can submit our proposed questions to defense counsel by the end of the day tomorrow, and hopefully then by Monday, we'll have a joint proposal for the Court as well as potential areas of conflict.

THE COURT: Likely I think we're talking about midweek realistically, for everybody.

Ms. Shroff, I can think of a scenario where it would be in your interest also to submit questions as you are exiting

or seeking to exit the case, to make sure that all the T's are crossed and I's are dotted, but you don't have to.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, our office's position is whatever Mr. Bahnasawy wants, Mr. Bahnasawy should have. He has made clear to us as well for whatever reasons, reasons are immaterial, he wants to change counsel, and I don't think we will have any questions, but I'm happy to make myself available to the government and to incoming counsel so that our availability is present for the Court.

THE COURT: Great. Is it your understanding that he's changed his view even from September 27? He always in the past when the issue came up said at the very least sometimes he wanted to stay with Federal Defenders very definitively, and other times he said, and I think I understand this, by the way. I understand that he's responding to his family, and he's a young man, so that's not inappropriate, but he also always more often said that the best of all worlds would be to have both you and incoming counsel.

Has that changed, in your opinion?

MS. SHROFF: I do think that's changed, your Honor.

(Counsel and defendant conferred)

MS. SHROFF: I do think that's changed, and I honestly, genuinely believe the reasons are immaterial. If he wants to make a change, he should be allowed to make a change. And just let me say, finality is good for him.

THE COURT: Yes, but I have somewhat of a different role and a different perspective, and expediency is not at the top of my list. Getting it right is No. 1. Respecting his wishes is also at the top of the list, but if you have any questions, it would be helpful to have you insert them in the government's or supplement.

MS. SHROFF: Sure.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I want to say one thing.

It's not expediency. I just want to say that, because he should be able to, it's good for him to resolve it. It's not expedience; it's for the client. That's all. I understand what the Court's saying, but look, given the schedule that you've set, I think this will be expedient anyway.

THE COURT: OK. If it is, so much the better, of course.

Are you available -- I hope you are -- Tuesday at 1 p.m. for further hearing to pose the questions? Does that work in your schedules?

MR. FRISCH: Tuesday's what date?

MS. SHROFF: The 7th, Election Day, according to the calendar. Is that a holiday, or is that some other year?

THE COURT: It may well be. Is that a court holiday?

MS. SHROFF: I don't see it as a court holiday. It just says Election Day in my calendar, but I'm fine at 1L00.

```
MR. FRISCH: November 7, I have an earlier appearance
1
      before Judge Wood, but I should be free by 1:00.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: OK. She's in the building here. You mean
 4
      Judge Wood be in the building here? You'll be in the building.
               MR. FRISCH: I'm sorry, your Honor.
 5
6
               THE COURT: You'll be in the building for that
 7
      appearance?
8
               MR. FRISCH: Yes, your Honor.
9
               THE COURT: Does 1:30 help you?
10
               MR. FRISCH: It might be a prudent thing to put it on
11
      for 1:30.
12
               MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, the government will be
13
      prepared to proceed. I will note that part of government
14
      counsel will not be available at 1:00. Later in the afternoon
15
      would be better for us if the Court's schedule does permit
16
      that.
17
               THE COURT: Could one of you be here at 1:30?
               MS. TEKEEI: Yes, but both of us can't.
18
               THE COURT: You both can't.
19
20
               MS. TEKEEI: That's correct, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Until when?
22
               MS. TEKEEI: May I just have one moment, your Honor?
23
               MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, as well, during this brief
24
      recess, I will not be available on Tuesday at 1:30, but
25
     Mr. Frisch will be here.
```

1 THE COURT: Is that OK? MR. FRISCH: Yes. 2 MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, obviously we don't want to 3 impose on the Court's schedule, but 3:00 would be better for 4 5 both of us. 6 THE COURT: I think I'm going to go with the 1:30. Ι 7 always prefer to have all of you here, but I think we can accomplish what we need to accomplish on Tuesday at 1:30. 8 9 MS. TEKEEI: Thank you, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: I'm going to ask that by Monday at 3 p.m. I have all of your questions, either in one document or if 11 12 there are supplements. 13 MS. TEKEEI: I'm sorry. What time was that, your 14 Honor? 15 THE COURT: Monday at 3. 16 MS. TEKEEI: At. 3? 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 MS. TEKEEI: Thank you. THE COURT: Has anybody got anything they want to add? 19 20 MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, just for clarification, 21 Mr. Frisch mentioned that he would like the December 12 date to 22 be a status conference. The government obviously would like to 23 proceed to sentencing as expeditiously as possible. We would 24 like some clarity. We would like to prepare for sentencing and 25 to be going forward with sentencing as quickly as possible, but

in terms of what the Court intends to do, given that there are some deadlines coming up for submissions, if you could provide us with some clarity about what you think would happen on December 12.

THE COURT: As you're meeting and conferring with respect to these questions, maybe you could meet and confer with respect to what is anticipated in terms of dates and submissions, etc., etc., and maybe on Tuesday you could apprise me of that as well.

I don't know that you'll be able to go through that whole thumb drive between now and then, but you'll probably have a better understanding of how much time you need and what you are proposing to do in that time.

Is that fair?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TEKEEI: We can do that, your Honor.

MR. FRISCH: And we'll do our best, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

I know there's something humorous that could be said here. Now, I don't know who would say it, Ms. Shroff or me, but I think it's better left unsaid.

I'll see you all on Tuesday at 1:30.

MS. TEKEEI: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. FRISCH: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. SHROFF: Thank you, your Honor.

(Adjourned)

COLUMN DICEDICE DEDODEE